

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/022,109	BECK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael I Poe	1732	

All Participants:
Status of Application: _____

 (1) Michael I Poe (Examiner).

(3) _____.

 (2) Scott Daniels (Applicant's attorney).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 11 June 2004
Time: 3:30 pm
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Potential rejections over U.S. Patent No. 3,977,153 to Schrenk

Claims discussed:

1-9 and 12-22

Prior art documents discussed:

U.S. Patent No. 3,977,153 to Schrenk
Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet
Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: On June 10, 2004, the examiner contacted the applicant's attorney to discuss U.S. Patent No. 3,977,153 to Schrenk and proposed amendments that would be necessary to place the application in condition for allowance. The examiner first stipulated that Schrenk was readable on claims 1-5 and 7. Specifically, Schrenk teaches, in column 6, 2nd paragraph, prevention of delamination by curling a trimmed edge of a container together with a lid to provide an interlock therebetween. However, the examiner further stipulated that Schrenk teaches away from the claimed embodiment set forth in claims 6, 8, 9 and 12-22 because the attachment of a lid in the process of Schrenk is essential to prevention of delamination yet not required by the applicant's invention. Specifically, there is no suggestion or teaching in the prior art that delamination can be prevented without attachment of a lid as suggested by Schrenk. In order to overcome the teachings of Schrenk, the examiner proposed amending claim 1 in the manner set forth in the Examiner's Amendment. Such amendments would require prevention of delamination without attachment of a lid or an additional container. Claim 6 was changed so that it was in agreement with the proposed changes in claim 1. Claims 13 and 18 were changed to correct minor typographical errors. The applicant's attorney approved the proposed changes and authorized the examiner to proceed with the changes via Examiner's Amendment on June 11, 2004. The title was changed so that it better reflected the allowed invention. Refer to the Examiner's Amendment for a complete listing of changes.